### Draft 3.1

**IEEE 802.3bn EPON Protocol over Coax (EPOC) TF 1st Sponsor recirculation ballot comments**

#### Proposed Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r01-1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Physical Layer (always capped)</td>
<td>Change &quot;physical layer&quot; to &quot;Physical Layer&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Page 27 does not reflect the latest version of the 802.3 boilerplate.</td>
<td>Change &quot;Implementors&quot; to &quot;Implementers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) unusual editing instruction</td>
<td>Change to: &quot;Insert 1.2.7 after 1.2.6 &quot;Accuracy and resolution of numerical quantities&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) In the editing instruction, &quot;references&quot; should be &quot;references&quot;</td>
<td>Change &quot;reference&quot; to &quot;references&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) Now that 1.4.345b has been removed, in the editing instruction, &quot;definitions&quot; should be &quot;definition&quot;</td>
<td>Change &quot;definitions&quot; to &quot;definition&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Proposed Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r01-1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html">http://www.ieee802.org/3/WG_tools/editorial/requirements/words.html</a> has: Physical Layer (always capped)</td>
<td>Change &quot;physical layer&quot; to &quot;Physical Layer&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Page 27 does not reflect the latest version of the 802.3 boilerplate.</td>
<td>Change &quot;Implementors&quot; to &quot;Implementers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) unusual editing instruction</td>
<td>Change to: &quot;Insert 1.2.7 after 1.2.6 &quot;Accuracy and resolution of numerical quantities&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) In the editing instruction, &quot;references&quot; should be &quot;references&quot;</td>
<td>Change &quot;reference&quot; to &quot;references&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(Page number from CMP version) Now that 1.4.345b has been removed, in the editing instruction, &quot;definitions&quot; should be &quot;definition&quot;</td>
<td>Change &quot;definitions&quot; to &quot;definition&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comment ID** r01-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Page 1 of 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type:** TR/technical required  ER/editorial required  GR/general required  T/technical  E/editorial  G/general

**Comment Status:** D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected  RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn

**Sort Order:** Comment ID

**Page 1 of 7**

---

5/13/2016 3:50:17 PM
Proposed Response

Cl 00  SC 0  P  L  #  r01-7
Anslow, Peter  
Ciena Corporation

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  Clause order
The order of IEEE 802.3 amendments is to have all annexes after all clauses (as it was in D3.0), as shown in the 802.3 FrameMaker template. In D3.1, Annex A and Annex 31A are interleaved with the clauses. Why was this change made?

SuggestedRemedy
Move Annex A and Annex 31A to be after Clause 103

Proposed Response

Cl 45  SC 45.2.1  P 41  L 5  #  r01-9
Anslow, Peter  
Ciena Corporation

Comment Type  E  Comment Status  D  Table 45-3
IEEE 802.3by-201x made changes to Table 45-3 which show the appropriate reserved row as "1.1809 through 1.2099"

SuggestedRemedy
Change the editing instruction to: "Change the reserved row for 1.1809 through 1.2099 in Table 45-3 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):
* in the first row change the strikethrough text to "2099"
* in the last row change "1.1959 through 1.32767" to "1.1959 through 1.2099"

Proposed Response

Cl 1  SC 1.4.134  P 28  L 41  #  r01-10
Law, David  
Hewlett Packard Enter

Comment Type  G  Comment Status  D  Table 45-3
The text 'For 10BROAD36,' should not be shown in underscore as this text was added by IEEE P802.3by.

SuggestedRemedy
See comment.

Proposed Response

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

REVISED
Per comment but also don't show "sSee" in mark-up as "See" was changed to "see" by P802.3by also.

Final version:
1.4.134 channel: In 10BROAD36 <uline>and 10GPASS-XR, </uline>a band of frequencies dedicated to a certain service transmitted on the broadband medium. Otherwise, a defined path along which data in the form of an electrical or optical signal passes. (For 10BROAD36, see IEEE Std 802.3, Clause 11<uline>, for 10GPASS-XR see Clause 100, Clause 101, and Clause 102</uline>.)
Draft 3.1
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Proposed Responses

---

### Comment ID: r01-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.3.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remein, Duane**
Futurewei Technologie

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** D

The reference in the following statement should be 101.4.4.4.4.
"The CNU reports supported optional modulations to the CLT via US_ModAbility variable see 101.4.3.4.5"

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change to 101.4.4.4.4

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

### Comment ID: r01-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>101.3.2.5.4</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remein, Duane**
Futurewei Technologie

**Comment Type:** T  **Comment Status:** D

Step 1) Add burst start marker and Step 9) Add burst end marker do not happen in FEC encoding. They are part of PMA.

**Suggested Remedy:**

In Step 7) change "codeword and move to step 9" to "codeword, exit."
In Step 8) change "step 9 else go to step 2." to "exit else go to step 1."
Remove these steps and renumber.

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

**REVISED**

See Response (copied below) to comment r01-25

Bin is defined in step 2: "the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin)". Change the number step text to read as follows:

1) If the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin) is sufficient to fill a long FEC codeword (BQ = 220), create a long FEC codeword. If Bin >= 220 remains true repeat step 1.
2) If 220 > Bin >=101, create a shortened long FEC codeword.
3) If 101 > Bin >= 76, create a medium FEC codeword.
4) If 76 > Bin >= 25, create a shortened medium FEC codeword.
5) If 25 > Bin = 12, create a short FEC codeword. If Bin >= 12 remains true repeat step 5.
6) If 12 > Bin >= 1, create a shortened short FEC codeword.

---

### Comment ID: r01-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.2.7a.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remein, Duane**
Futurewei Technologie

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** D

extra period at end of line. "shown in Table 45-211f. ."

**Suggested Remedy:**
strike spare period.

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

### Comment ID: r01-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remein, Duane**
Futurewei Technologie

**Comment Type:** E  **Comment Status:** D

Amendment number has been set by Mr. Law

**Suggested Remedy:**
Add "Amendment 5-

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

### Comment ID: r01-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remein, Duane**
Futurewei Technologie

**Comment Type:** ER  **Comment Status:** D

Clauses mis-ordered

**Suggested Remedy:**
Change to FM, 1, 30, 45, 56, 67, 76, 100, 101, 102, 103 Annex A, Annex 31A, Annex 100A.

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

---

### Comment ID: r01-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.3.3.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT.</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laubach, Mark**
Broadcom Corporation

**Comment Type:** TR  **Comment Status:** D

Change "product" to "accumulation"

**Suggested Remedy:**
As per comment

**Proposed Response:**
PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Laubach, Mark
Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D
The second xref in first sentence should point to Table 100-8

Proposed Response
As per comment

Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Laubach, Mark
Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D
The first xref second/last sentence should point to Table 100-9

Proposed Response
As per comment

Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Laubach, Mark
Broadcom Corporation

Comment Type: TR
Comment Status: D
In Table 100-11, change g.e. sign to "to" to match subclause text.

Proposed Response
As per comment

Response Status: W
PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
REVISED
Per comment.
NOTE: Range is 7.4 MHz to 204 MHz. The xref provides additional information.
### Proposed Responses

#### Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 P 151 L 13 # r01-22

Laubach, Mark  
Broadcom Corporation

**Comment Type**: TR  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Suggested Remedy**: Layer violation. Insertion of the start/stop burst markers is performed by the symbol mapper in the PMA.

**Proposed Response**

Remove steps 1) and 12)

**Response Status**: W  
**Proposed Accept in Principle**.

**REVISED**

See Response (copied below) to comment r01-25.

Bin is defined in step 2: "the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin)". Change the number step text to read as follows:

1) If the number of available 65-bit blocks (Bin) is sufficient to fill a long FEC codeword ($BQ = 220$), create a long FEC codeword. If Bin $\geq 220$ remains true repeat step 1.
2) If $220 > Bin > 101$, create a shortened long FEC codeword.
3) If $101 > Bin > 76$, create a medium FEC codeword.
4) If $76 > Bin > 25$, create a shortened medium FEC codeword.
5) If $25 > Bin > 12$, create a short FEC codeword. If Bin $\geq 12$ remains true repeat step 5.
6) If $12 > Bin > 1$, create a shortened short FEC codeword.

#### Cl 100 SC 100.3.6.1 P 114 L 38 # r01-24

Laubach, Mark  
Broadcom Corporation

**Comment Type**: TR  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Suggested Remedy**: Change ": <newline> For" to "and for" remove newline. Add a colon to the end of the sentence. Adjust row/line alignments.

**Proposed Response**

As per comment  
**Proposed Accept**.

#### Cl 101 SC 101.3.2.5.4 P 151 L 13 # r01-25

Laubach, Mark  
Broadcom Corporation

**Comment Type**: TR  
**Comment Status**: D  
**Burst Markers**

Bin is not defined. Looping may not be correct as drafted, i.e., should continue looping until not enough for a long codeword, move to next tests, etc. The text here should not be confused with the state machine / pseudo code used in 101.3.2.5.7, and should remain in its prior descriptive format.

**Suggested Remedy**

Revert to previous text, lines 13 through 39.

**Proposed Response**

As per comment  
**Proposed Accept**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: r01-26</th>
<th>Comment Type: E</th>
<th>Comment Status: D</th>
<th>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: E</td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: r01-27</th>
<th>Comment Type: TR</th>
<th>Comment Status: D</th>
<th>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: TR</td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect base text for Table 45-3. IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015 has changed the reserved row in 802.3-2015 (what is included in the current draft) to define registers starting at 1.2100.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the editing instruction to simply read, Change the 1.17 row of Table 45-3 (as modified by IEEE Std 802.3bw) as shown below. Only show 1.17 row in Table 45-3 changes with Reserved in strikethrough and new register name and subclause underscore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Response:</td>
<td>Response Status: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: r01-28</th>
<th>Comment Type: TR</th>
<th>Comment Status: D</th>
<th>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: TR</td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect base text for Table 45-3. IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015 has changed the reserved row in 802.3-2015 (what is included in the current draft) to define registers starting at 1.2100.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the editing instruction to: &quot;Change the reserved row for 1.1809 through 1.2099 in Table 45-3 (as inserted by IEEE Std 802.3bw-2015) as follows (unchanged rows not shown):&quot; in the first row change the strikethrough text to &quot;2099&quot; in the last row change &quot;1.1959 through 1.32767&quot; to &quot;1.1959 through 1.2099&quot;</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: r01-29</th>
<th>Comment Type: ER</th>
<th>Comment Status: D</th>
<th>Proposed Response: PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow, Robert</td>
<td>RMG Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Type: ER</td>
<td>Comment Status: D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections jump from 45.2.1.130z5 for register 1.1948 to 45.2.1.1301b6 for register 1.1949. Table numbers jump from 45-98az5 to 45-99a01.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Remedy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix to be consecutive with the required convoluted numbering.</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The revised comments and suggested remedies are based on the corrected versions of the draft and are not present in the clean version (see additional file on ballot site).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Proposed Response</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r01-30</td>
<td>Verify the remainder of the numbering.</td>
<td>PROPOSED REJECT.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r01-31</td>
<td>You may mark all my D3.0 comments as satisfied as remaining errors are covered by comments on D3.1</td>
<td>PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grow, Robert  
RMG Consulting

Standards are professionally edited by IEEE editors prior to publication.

Thank you for this input.